DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 957 CS 504 888

AUTHOR Hugenberg, Lawrence W.
TITLE Student Expectations of Teacher Affect in the Basic Speech Communication Class.
PUB DATE [83]
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Behavior; Behavior Patterns; *Communication Research; *Expectation; Females; Higher Education; Interaction; Males; Prior Learning; Private Colleges; Sex Differences; *Speech Communication; State Universities; *Student Reaction; *Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

To determine what students expected their speech teachers to be like, students in introductory speech courses at two universities were asked to complete a questionnaire on the first day of class, prior to meeting their instructor. The students were told their instructor was male or female, but otherwise were given no information about the teacher. The questionnaire consisted of 5 demographic questions and 25 Likert-type scale items concerning affective communication behaviors. Results showed that students in the private university tended to have higher expectations of affective communication behaviors than students in similar courses at a state university. Expectations of teacher behavior did not seem to be related to previous experiences in speech classes or previous knowledge or interaction with the teacher. Males seemed to expect closer personal ties with the instructor, though females did expect the instructor to help them when necessary. Regardless of the reasons for which they enrolled in the class, students shared similar expectations for the instructor's affective behavior. In addition, they had similar expectations for both male and female instructors. The questionnaire and several tables showing student responses are included. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED255957

STUDENT EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHER AFFECT IN THE BASIC SPEECH COMMUNICATION CLASS

Lawrence W. Hugenberg

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lawrence W. Hugenberg
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 888

Researchers have focused attention on the identification of the affective dimensions of teacher classroom communication. Much of this research has focused on student evaluations of teachers at the end of an academic term or on the descriptions of the "ideal" instructor. Little, if any, research has sought to identify the students' expectations of teachers' affective communication styles. This study investigated the perceptions and expectations of students in basic speech classes prior to the first class period and thus prior to actual interaction with an instructor. The expectations of affective communication styles may have been implications for teaching evaluations and student satisfaction with classes and instructors. The affective dimension of teacher classroom communication is an important variable in ascertaining overall teacher effectiveness, as perceived from the student's vantage point.

Importance of Affective Communication for Teachers

Considerable importance is placed upon student evaluations of teachers by college administrators, researchers, and teachers themselves. Recent studies indicate that approximately 70% of communication departments which employ Graduate Teaching Assistants use some type of formal student evaluations in judging the effectiveness of the teachers.[1] McLaughlin, Erikson, and Ellison reviewed several studies which factor analyzed student evaluation forms and concluded, "virtually every factor analytic study of the dimensions instructional effectiveness published in the last five years has uncovered an affective factor or set of subscales."[2] Seemingly, if students are to evaluate instructors completely, the instruments used for the evaluation must contain items which measure the affective dimension of teacher communication. A necessary first step in the process of evaluating the affective behaviors is to identify those behaviors.

In related research, Rosenfeld investigated the degree to which supportive and defensive climates relate to the student's liking for the class.[3] He found that classes which are liked are those in which the teacher's behaviors are predominantly empathic. He describes the supportive empathic climate as:

> The teacher communicates to the students that he or she understands their problems and how they view the class material. Confirming responses also characterize the teacher in a supportive classroom: he or she expresses value for the students by taking the time and energy to be straightforward and honest, and explaining his or her opinions and assignments.[4]

The supportive climate described by Rosenfeld is clearly suggestive of the affective dimension and indicates that students judge the attractiveness of a course based, at least in part, on positively perceived, affective teacher behaviors.

The importance of the affective dimension of teacher competency is indicated in studies reported by Swinton and Bassett.[5] They surveyed secondary speech communication/drama teachers concerning critical competencies that should be possessed by speech/drama teachers. Personality Characteristics (such as the projection of enthusiasm, wanting to help students, sense of humor) and Interpersonal Skills and Relationships (such as seeking open relationships with students, showing respect for the students) were ranked first and second, respectively, in importance to effective teaching. Instructors who responded recognize the importance of affective communication skills in effective teaching.

Some research has also indicated a relationship between affective communication behaviors and student learning.[6] Student self-concept, work output, productivity, and skills acquisition seem to be at least partially influenced by teacher behavior

which is rewarding and empathic. Positive affective communication styles seem to influence student satisfaction with the course and their subsequent performance of course work. Similar findings can be found in organizational research where worker performance improves under supervision characterized by positive affective behaviors.[7]

The affective dimension of teacher communication seems important to both student attitudes toward the course and teacher as well as the quality of student performance and learning. In an era in which dwindling enrollments cause concern for the continued success of basic speech communication programs, in which teachers and departments essentially compete for students, and in which the basic speech course can effect student's desires to enroll in upper division speech courses,[8] attention to the affective dimension of teacher behavior seems even more critical. Students will enroll in courses which are perceived as satisfying and will continue to enroll in courses which meet their expectations of effective teacher behavior. Affective communication styles are a major component of student liking for a course and hence, may effect their continued enrollment in speech communication classes. Speech instructors must not overlook the importance of identifying and adopting appropriate affective communication styles to facilitate pedagogical outcomes.

Components of Affective Communication Styles

Previous research has sought to identify the dimensions of affective communication styles. Most of the research has been conducted via questionnaires and rating scales that require the students to rate the actual behaviors of instructors. Conducted at the end of an academic term or at mid-term, these students identify the behaviors the teachers actually perform during the class.[9] Other research has attempted to identify the affective dimensions of teacher communication by asking the students to imagine an "ideal" speech communication instructor and describe

what they perceived as ideal or desired behaviors.[10] These investigations of ideal teachers also are conducted after the student has been exposed to actual teacher behavior in the communication classroom.

The research has identified several descriptive dimensions of teacher behavior that have been described as directive vs. nondirective,[11] accepting vs. rejecting,[12] praising vs. criticizing,[13] warmth vs. acceptance,[14] enthusiasm and interaction,[15] and tolerance of other's viewpoints.[16] In essence, the affective dimension seems to be those behaviors which treat students with respect, which listen to students empathically, and which provide positive feedback on student behaviors. The positive affective style is one in which teachers interact with students on a personal, face-to-face level and demonstrate a tolerance for student opinions. Affective styles also include an enthusiasm for teaching and course material, and a demonstration of a sense of humor.

Importantly, these dimensions of affective communication behaviors were measured after exposure to actual teacher behavior in the speech classroom. The impact of the actual teacher's behavior is seemingly a confounding variable in student perceptions of affective behaviors. The investigation of ideal behaviors would be contaminated by the actual behaviors observed in the classroom.

This study attempted to determine what students expected their speech teachers to be like. Prior expectations of teacher behavior may have a significant impact on the evaluation of actual teacher behavior. For example, if a student expects the communication instructor to be warm and empathic, the student may actually perceive the teacher's behavior as supportive. Another student in the same class who expects the teacher to be impersonal and distant may perceive the same behaviors as fulfilling those expectations. It seems important to determine student expectations of teacher affective communication prior to actual interaction

and observation of the teacher in the classroom.

Demographic variables relevant to the study which may affect expectations of affective behaviors would include the overall educational environment, the student's previous experiences with the instructor and with speech classes, the sex of the instructor and the sex of the student, and whether the class was required or an elective. To investigate the overall educational environment, the study was conducted at both a four-year state university and a private four-year college. A common perception of private schools is that there is closer and more intimate contact between faculty and students. State schools are often perceived as more impersonal and less intimate. The review of literature and consideration of the influence of demographic variables led to the following hypotheses:

(1) Students in a private school will expect a greater degree of affective teacher behavior than would students in a state school.

(2) Students with previous interaction with speech teachers and speech classes will expect a greater degree of affective teacher behavior than students who have no prior experience.

(3) Sex of the student will affect the expectations of teacher affective behavior.

(4) Sex of the instructor will affect the expectations of teacher affective behavior.

(5) Students who take the class as an elective will have a greater expectation of teacher affective behavior than students who are required to take the class.

Procedure

Subjects were students in introductory speech courses at two different mid-western universities. Subjects from a state institution (N=361) were enrolled in public speaking and business and professional speaking courses. Students in the private university (N=224) were enrolled in the basic public speaking classes. In both universities, class size ranged from 20 to 25 students. Table 1 indicates the demographic breakdown of the sample for each of the universities.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Insert Table 1

About Here

* * * * * * * * * * * *

On the first day of class, prior to meeting their instructor, the students were asked to complete a questionnaire to determine the expectations of their instructor. The students were told their instructor was male or female, but otherwise were given no information about the teacher. The students received the following instructions prior to completing the questionnaire:

> "We are interested in your expectations of your speech instructor for this class. Please answer each of the questions below in terms of how you <u>expect</u> the teacher to actually behave in the class this term. Focus your expectations of your teacher's actual behaviors -- <u>not</u> your idea of an ideal instructor or what your want or desire your instructor to be like. Your responses will be completely confidential and anonymous and will have no bearing on your grade in this course."

To control for the influence of information about the instructor gathered through the grapevine or through prior classes the student may have had with the same instructor, the students were asked whether or not they had heard about the instructor from others or had met the instructor previously. Only a small percentage of the state school students had previous interactions or knowledge and about a third of the private school students had some knowledge of the instructor. Analysis of the students' responses indicated no significant differences between students with and without prior knowledge, so the students were collapsed into one group, regardless of previous knowledge.

The questionnaire consisted of 5 demographic questions (listed in Table 1) and 25 Likert-type scale items concerning affective communication behaviors. The students were asked to respond to each statement on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 2 lists the questions used in the questionnaire.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Insert Table 2

About Here

* * * * * * * * * * * *

The statements were generated from previous questionnaires which measured affective behaviors and perceptions and from concerns identified by organizational climate research and research on supportive classroom behaviors. An attempt was made to include items that reflected the components of affective behaviors identified in previous literature and reviewed previously in this paper.

The hypotheses were tested by comparing each demographic subgroup's responses through Analysis of Variance procedures. Each comparison was a one-way ANOVA with each demographic variable consisting of two sub-dimensions. Significance for each test was set at $p < .01$.

In addition, a principle components factor analysis with oblique rotation was computed to ascertain the underlying factor structure of the questionnaire. Questions which had at least a .60 loading factor on the principle factor and no more than .40 loading on any other factor were included in each factor. At least two questions had to load on a factor for it to be considered in the analysis.

The split-half reliability estimate for the questionnaire was .76.

Results

The factor analysis resulted in the emergence of five factors accounting for 94.7% of the total variance. The first factor, which accounted for 54.7% of the variance, was identified as "Enjoys Teaching" and included items related to "enjoy teaching," "demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material," "promote class discussion of course material," and " make the student feel welcome when visiting the office." These items seem to identify a global perception of teaching enjoyment, i.e., the teacher enjoys the classroom experience, is involved with the subject matter, and enjoys interacting with students.

The second factor was labelled "Entertainment" and included two items. The teacher was expected to "tell jokes and stories not related to the subject matter," but was not expected to "act foolish in class in order to get students to laugh." This factor indicates an expectation dimension that teachers offer entertainment even when such is not related to course materials.

The fourth factor, labelled "Role Distance," seems to be the converse of Factor III. It included items related to "not maintaining a rigid distance between student and teacher" and "not being impersonal and distant with the student." This factor suggests that students do not expect rigid student-teacher role relationships.

The third factor seems to be the obverse of Factor IV and is termed "Interaction." Three scales comprise the factor including "feeling comfortable talking about personal matters," "talking with the instructor outside of class," and "being friends

with the instructor."

A fifth factor, "Empathy," may be categorized by expectations that instructors understand and recognize student problems and energies expended. The following scales were used to evaluate this factor: "instructor is concerned with student problems" and "instructor is empathic toward student problems." This factor seems to indicate an additional expectation that instructors are interpersonally available and concerned with students as people. Table 3 summarizes the scales for each factor and the rotated loadings of each item on the five factors.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Insert Table 3

About Here

* * * * * * * * * * * *

A one-way ANOVA was calculated on demographic subgroups in order to test each of the hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 compared responses of students in public university with the students in the private university. Table 4 summarizes the comparison for each individual question and for the five factors discussed above. In general private school students tended to have higher expectations on virtually every question.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Insert Table 4

About Here

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Specifically, a significant difference was found for items related to enjoy teaching, comfortable talking outside of class, telling personal stories, demonstrate enthusiasm, promote one-to-one interaction in and out of class, promote

dicussion in class, and be empathic toward student problems. In general, the results indicate that private school students have higher expectations that they will have more interaction with the instructor both in and out of the classroom and that the instructor will enjoy teaching.

Hypothesis 2 tested the effect of previous experience by the student in other speech classes. No significant differences were found between students who had other speech courses and those who were enrolled in their first speech course.

Hypothesis 3 compared expectations of female and male students. Significant differences were found on items concerning comfortable talking about personal matters, tells jokes unrelated to class material, acting foolish in order to get laughs, being criticized negatively in front of class, and assist students on an individual basis. Males tended to expect to feel more comfortable talking about personal matters, expected more jokes, and expected more negative criticism. Female students had higher expectations that the teacher would act foolish in class and be more willing to help them on an individual basis. These results are summarized in Table 5.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Insert Table 5

About Here

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Hypothesis 4 compared expectations of male instructors vs. female instructors. No significant differences were found in expectations of male vs. female teachers.

Hypothesis 5 compared expectations of students who enrolled in the course as an elective with those who were required to take the course. No significant differences were found.

A final comparison of demographic subgroups was based on the factors identified during the factor analysis. The responses to each question in the factor were summed and divided by the number of questions. An average score for each factor was thus calculated for each student. Comparison of these factor scores was calculated with a one-way ANOVA and revealed that schools differed on Factor I while male and female students differed on Factors II and III.

Discussion

Students in beginning public speaking classes were asked to describe their expectations of their instructors prior to interaction with them. Each student responded to a 25 Likert-type questions to indicate their expectations of their instructor's affective communication behaviors. Comparison of demographic subgroups was made by calculating a one-way ANOVA for each question. Factor analysis of the data indicated four factors accounting for 84% of the total variance which were labelled: (1) Enjoys Teaching, (2) Entertainment, (3) Role Distance, and (4) Empathic Closeness.

The results indicate support for Hypothesis 1. Students differ in their expectations of instructors depending upon whether they attend a public state university or a private university. Students in the private university tended to have higher expectations of affective communication behaviors than students in similar courses at a state university. This finding is consistent with the general perception that private schools are more personal and there is more contact between student and teacher. Specifically, students at the private school indicate an expectation of more personal, one-to-one interaction inside and outside of class and that the instructor will enjoy teaching.

Expectations of teacher behavior do not seem to be related to previous experiences in speech classes or previous knowledge or interaction with the teacher. Hypothesis 2 was not supported which indicated that students form expectations of teachers that are fairly stable, i.e., the expectations are not overly influenced by previous experience in high school speech classes or by information about the instructor or class obtained from other students.

Hypothesis 3 was partially supported in that males had higher expectations that the instructor would tell jokes unrelated to subject matter, that they would feel comfortable talking with students about personal matters, and that they expected to be criticized negatively in front of class. Female students perceived that their instructors would act foolish in order to get laughs and that the instructors would be willing to help them on an individual basis. Males tended to have higher expectations on Factor III, i.e., that the instructors would interact with them on a personal basis. The results seem to indicate a general pattern of perceptions that males expect closer personal ties with the instructor than females, though females do expect the instructor to help them when necessary. The expectations of a closer relationship may partially explain a difference in expectations regarding the use of humor in the classroom. The males expected jokes and stories unrelated to subject matter but had lower expectations that the instructor would act foolish just to get laughs. If the females felt that they would not be interpersonally close to the instructor, it is perhaps more likely that they would interpret jokes and stories which were unrelated to the subject matter to be "foolish" and designed just to get laughs. Males, on the other hand, may interpret the same jokes and stories as a positive affective behavior which illustrates the instructor's willingness to suspend the academic norms of

"sticking to the subject" since the instructor and students are friends.

Hypothesis 4 and Hypothesis 5 were not supported by the results of this study. Students seem to have similar expectations for both male and female instructors. Regardless of the reason for which they enrolled in the class, students share similar expectations for the instructor's affective behavior. These results seem to run counter to intuitive assumptions that males are perceived differently than females and that students who are required to take the course will tend to be more negative in their expectations than students who enroll voluntarily. It may be that the students are responding to a generalized perception of the role of instructor and thus expect that anyone, whether male of female, will fulfill those role expectations to the same degree. Students who take the course as a requirement may be less than enthused about the subject matter and assignments than voluntarily enrolled students, but still expect similar affective behaviors from instructors.

The results of this study are similar to the results of other studies of affective communication in the speech classroom. As in studies of actual teacher behavior and studies of ideal teacher behavior, this study suggests that the affective dimension is comprised of factors related to acceptance and empathy for the student, enthusiasm and enjoyment of teaching, and a lack of interpersonal distance and role rigidity. In addition, this study indicates that the entertainment dimension of teacher behavior is an expected affective dimension that is not clearly identified in previous research.

Further research is needed to determine the relationship betwsen initial expectations of teacher affective behavior and subsequent evaluations of the teacher's effectiveness. It may be that expectations of behavior which differ significantly from perceptions of actual behavior may be affecting evaluation of

teacher effectiveness. It would also be interesting to identify the expectations students have of affective behavior of teachers in other disciplines. Do students expect the same type of interpersonal closeness, entertainment, enthusiasm, and lack of role distance from biology, history, and/or chemistry teachers? Is there something unique about the subject matter in speech communication courses that warrants expectations of high affective behavior? What other demographic variables, e.g., personality traits, family background, ACT or SAT scores, may influence expectations and perceptions of affective communication behaviors. The affective dimension of teacher communicator style is important both in evaluation of teacher effectiveness and in contributing to successful learning environments for students. Additional research is needed to further define the variable and increase the understanding of variables that affect student expectations and perceptions of affective teacher behavior.

Fulfilling student expectations of teacher affect and reaching pedagogical objectives appear to be two obvious goals of speech instructors. Seemingly, if students' expectations are met concerning teacher affect and learning, their perceptions of the speech communication discipline might be enhanced. In a time of declining enrollments and competition for student credit hours, speech communication educators should become increasingly concerned with student perceptions of instructors and courses. It is not likely that students will enroll in courses with negative impressions. This research suggests expectations of students; meeting those expectations is the responsibility of individual instructors, supervisors of instructors, and department chairpersons.

REFERENCES

1. Donald D. Yoder and Lawrence W. Hugenberg, "A Survey of In-Service Teacher Training Programs for Graduate Teaching Assistants in the Basic Speech Course," ACA Bulletin, January (1982).

2. Margaret L. McLaughlin, Keith V. Erikson, and Margaret A. Ellison, "A Scale for the Measurement of Teachers' Affective Communication," Communication Education, 29 (1980), 21-23.

3. Lawrence B. Rosenfeld, "Communication Climate and Coping Mechanisms in the College Classroom," Communication Education, 32 (1983), 167-74.

4. Rosenfeld, p. 172.

5. Marilyn M. Swinton and Ronald E. Bassett, "Teachers' Perceptions of Competencies Needed for Effective Speech Communication and Drama Instruction," Communication Education, 30 (1981), 146-55.

6. For a summary of research which investigates the relationship of learning and affective teacher behavior see McLaughlin, et. al., 1980, p. 22.

7. For a summary of research relating positive and supportive climates and positive and supportive supervisor behavior with worker production see Gerald Goldhaber, Organizational Communication (3rd Edition), (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1983).

8. Yoder and Hugenberg.

9. McLaughlin, et. al., 1980.

10. Margaret McLaughlin and Keith Erikson, "A Multidimensional Scaling Analysis of the 'Ideal Interpersonal Communication Instructor," Communication Education, 30 (1981), 393-8.

11. Harold H. Anderson and J.E. Brewer, Studies of Teacher's Classroom Personalities I: Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior of Kindergarten Teachers (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1945); McLaughlin, et. al., 1980.

12. B.W. Tuckman and M.S. Fabian, "Teaching Styles of Vocational Teachers Judged as More or Less Competent," Journal of Experimental Education, 46 (1977), 5-10.

13. Gertrude Moskowitz and John L. Hayman, "Interaction Patterns of First Year, 'Typical,' and 'Best' Teachers in Inner-City Schools," The Journal of Educational Research, 67 (1974), 224-30.

14. Tuckman and Fabian.

15. Herbert W. Marsh, "The Validity of Students' Evaluations: Classroom Evaluations of Instructors Independently Nominated as Best and Worst Teachers by Graduating Seniors," American Educational Research Journal, 14 (1977), 744-7; McLaughlin and Erikson, 1981.

16. Susan E. Whitely and Kenneth O. Doyle, "Implicit Theories in Student Ratings," American Educational Research Journal, 13 (1976), 241-53.

Table 1

Demographic Subgroups for Private

and Pubic University Samples

	Public University N / %	Private University N / %	Total Sample N / %
Sex of Student			
Male	226 / 63.8	119 / 54.3	345 / 60.5
Female	125 / 35.3	100 / 45.7	225 / 37.4
Sex of Instructor			
Male	245 / 70.4	137 / 62.8	382 / 67.5
Female	103 / 29.6	81 / 37.2	184 / 32.5
Previous experience in Other Speech Class			
Some	154 / 44.1	141 / 64.4	295 / 51.9
None	195 / 55.9	78 / 35.6	273 / 49.1
Previous Experience or Knowledge of Instructor			
Some	23 / 6.5	71 / 32.4	94 / 16.4
None	332 / 93.5	148 / 67.6	480 / 84.6
Reason for Enrolling			
Elective	77 / 22.1	106 / 48.4	183 / 32.2
Required	272 / 77.9	113 / 51.6	385 / 67.8
Total N *	361	224	585

*the subtotals for individual demographic categories may be less than the total N due to missing information on some questionnaires.

Table 2

Expectations of Teacher Affective Communication:

Questionnaire Items

1. I expect to feel comfortable in talking with my instructor about class-related matters.
2. I expect to feel comfortable in talking with my instructor abour personal matters.
3. I expect my instructor to be friends with me.
4. I expect to feel comfprtable in talking with my instructor outside of class.
5. I expect my instructor enjoys teaching.
6. I expect my instructor to be displeased when students offer differing views.
7. I expect my instructor to use humorous examples to illustrate subject matter.
8. I expect my instructor to maintain a rigid distance between the students and the teacher.
9. I expect my instructor to use personal stories and examples to illustrate subject matter.
10. I expect my instructor to tell jokes and/or humorous stories that do not relate to the subject matter.
11. I expect my instructor to act foolish in class in order to get students to laugh.
12. I expect to be criticized negatively by the instructor in front of class.
13. I expect the instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.
14. I expect the instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me in class.
15. I expect the instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me outside of class.
16. I expect the instructor to promote class discussion of subject matter and related material.
17. I expect the instructor to lecture more than lead class discussion.

18. I expect the instructor to make me feel welcome when I see her or him in the office.
19. I expect the instructor to be inflexible in administering course policies and requirements.
20. I expect the instructor to be concerned about my problems.
21. I expect the instructor to relate to me on my level.
22. I expect the instructor to desire to assist me on an individual basis.
23. I expect the instructor to be empathic towards my problems.
24. I expect the instructor to want me to succeed.
25. I expect the instructor to be impersonal and distant with me.

Table 3

Factor Loadings*

Questions	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	
13	.601	.049	.391	.113	-.220	
18	.719	-.017	-.146	.059	.266	
21	.805	.039	-.110	.002	.020	Enjoys Teaching
24	.713	-.105	.070	-.075	-.098	
9	-.113	.980	-.163	-.025	-.166	
10	-.240	.645	-.108	.154	.002	Entertaining
1	-.015	-.089	.796	-.027	-.093	
2	-.303	-.052	.655	.010	.073	Interaction
3	-.109	.041	.686	.027	.027	
4	.089	-.117	.915	.074	-.096	
8	.140	-.004	-.074	.737	.009	Distance
25	-.087	.072	-.032	.601	-.088	
20	-.002	-.128	-.023	.065	.796	
22	.163	-.062	-.022	.023	.613	Empathy
23	-.141	-.065	-.057	.023	.703	

* Delta .40

Table 4

Comparison of Responses for Private and Public Universities

Question	Public University mean/s.d.	Private University mean/s.d.	Total mean/s.d.
1	3.92/1.03	4.11/0.82	3.98/0.97
2	2.89/0.99	2.74/0.87	2.83/0.95
3	3.41/0.96	3.56/0.81	3.47/0.91
4	3.68/0.89	3.96/0.71*	3.78/0.83
5	4.11/1.00	4.30/0.83*	4.18/0.94
6	1.57/1.01	1.71/0.93	1.62/0.99
7	3.45/0.86	3.51/0.81	3.47/0.84
8	2.01/0.92	1.88/0.80	1.96/0.88
9	3.21/0.85	3.46/0.78*	3.34/0.83
10	2.77/0.99	2.68/0.91	2.73/0.96
11	1.98/0.97	1.97/0.88	1.98/0.94
12	1.86/1.11	2.00/1.03	1.91/1.08
13	3.96/0.98	4.23/0.75*	4.06/0.91
14	3.21/0.89	3.50/0.82*	3.33/0.88
15	2.97/0.89	3.22/0.84*	3.07/0.88
16	3.94/1.00	4.14/0.67*	4.01/0.90
17	2.64/1.04	2.75/0.93	2.68/1.00
18	3.88/1.01	4.03/0.73	3.93/0.91
19	2.46/1.16	2.51/1.04	2.48/1.11
20	3.26/0.92	3.40/0.84	3.31/0.89
21	3.66/0.91	3.67/0.81	3.66/0.87
22	3.45/0.82	3.69/0.83*	3.54/0.83
23	3.16/0.85	3.18/0.77	3.16/0.82
24	3.98/0.95	4.01/0.88	3.99/0.92
25	1.88/0.94	1.80/0.82	1.85/0.89
Factor 1	3.92/0.84	4.12/0.68*	4.02/0.79
Factor 2	2.57/0.90	2.53/0.81	2.55/0.87
Factor 3	3.61/0.80	3.68/0.70	3.63/0.76
Factor 4	2.07/0.85	1.97/0.78	2.03/0.83
Factor 5	3.29/0.76	3.36/0.70	3.32/0.74

*$p < .01$

Table 5

Comparison of Responses for

Male and Female Students

Question	Male Students mean/s.d.	Female Students mean/s.d.
1	4.02/0.96	3.94/0.98
2	2.94/0.93	2.65/0.95*
3	3.51/0.91	3.38/0.89
4	3.80/0.84	3.76/0.82
5	4.21/0.91	4.15/0.99
6	1.62/0.96	1.61/0.99
7	3.49/0.87	3.44/0.81
8	4.03/0.87	4.09/0.89
9	3.38/0.84	3.28/0.83
10	2.83/0.96	2.61/0.95*
11	3.95/0.97	4.15/0.88*
12	2.02/1.09	1.76/1.05*
13	4.05/0.90	4.09/0.93
14	3.37/0.85	3.27/0.90
15	3.08/0.81	3.04/0.97
16	4.05/0.86	3.97/0.95
17	2.67/0.97	2.70/1.06
18	3.93/0.92	3.97/0.90
19	2.49/1.15	2.46/1.07
20	3.33/0.88	3.29/0.91
21	3.63/0.87	3.72/0.88
22	3.47/0.83	3.66/0.81
23	3.17/0.80	3.16/0.85
24	4.00/0.92	3.97/0.92
25	4.12/0.91	4.22/0.86
Factor I	4.03/0.76	4.00/0.82
Factor II	2.65/0.88	2.42/0.82*
Factor III	3.39/0.76	3.57/0.75*
Factor IV	2.07/0.82	1.96/0.82
Factor V	3.32/0.74	3.34/0.72